



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,961	03/30/2001	Mark Bungler	SFTC-01004US0	8324

28554 7590 06/29/2007
VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 MARKET STREET SUITE 2500
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

EXAMINER

HAIDER, FAWAAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/29/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/822,961	Applicant(s) BUNGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Fawaad Haider	Art Unit 3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kliger et al. in view of Gardenswartz et al.

Kliger et al. and Gardenswartz et al. disclose a method for facilitating a transaction between at least one user, at least one merchant, and at least one associate. Kliger et al. disclose:

transferring, from a user processing device to an associate processing device, a user identification value (official notice is taken of the old and well known practice of passing a PC identification value along with communications emanating from a user computer);

inputting by a user, into the user processing device, an address for an associate Web site on the associate processing device (col. 4 lines 9-12, the client computer with web browser 200 requests a web page from a web server 210 (the associate processing device) using a URL);

transferring, into the user processing device from the associate processing device, a first merchant link for a first merchant Web site on a first merchant processing device (col. 4, lines 13-18,...the web page server 210 will store a cookie on the client computer as part of the reply to the input on the web page);

selecting, by the user, the first merchant link (user makes a request for a web page col. 4 line 38);

transferring, into the user processing device from the associate processing device, information regarding a first product from the first merchant Web site (advertisement banners are read as information which are transferred into the user client computer from the associate processing device 210);

converting the user identification value to a promotional information (the cookie from the user device is read as an identification value which must contain the ID for the user in order to cause promotional information e.g. profile data to be retrieved see col. 5 lines 5-15);

transferring, from the associate processing device to the merchant processing device, the promotional information and the purchase information (the profile information at server 230 is read as the agent for the merchant and the cookie associated with the

Art Unit: 3627

user is read as promotional information which passes from the server 210 to the server 230).

However, there appears to be no disclosure in Kliger et al. for:

selecting, by the user, the first product to purchase;

providing, by the user, purchase information for purchasing the first product;

adding the promotional information, by the associate processing device, to the purchase information responsive to the user identification value;

transferring, from the user processing device to the associate processing device, the purchase information.

However, Gardenswartz et al. do disclose collecting consumer purchase histories once a selection is made a data base 8 is updated. It would be obvious to modify Kliger et al. to provide a purchase based system and include as part of the profile 255 the purchase habits of the user, the motivation would be better direct marketing techniques.

Claim 2. In Kliger et al., a browser is a proxy server.

Claim 3. Official notice is taken of browser framing.

Claim 4. In Kliger et al., an advertisement is read as a key value (see Figure 2 and col.4, lines 7-26).

Claim 6. In Kliger et al., see applets as transferring to a second merchant site.

Claims 5,7,8. Gardenswartz et al disclose a CID card having the user identification value and a pass code value associated with a purchased product package, and also provides a list of merchant links responsive to those values (see Figures 2a, 3, 7-8). It would be obvious to transfer, from the user processing device in Kliger et al to the

associate processing device, the pass code value of Gardenswartz et al. the motivation being the identification of the user and the merchant links as part of the Applets in Kliger et al would obviously respond to the ID.

Claim 9. In Kliger et al., profile parameter database 255 is relational.

Claim 10. In Kliger et al., advertisements are always focused on key issues.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/10/2007 with respect to claims 1-10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. First, the applicant argues that the "cookie" or "PC identification value" is being improperly used as "identification value" or "promotional information." In col.5, lines 5-15, the application discloses, "... server 230 uses the information contained in Applet server cookie 207 to communicate with a profile process 250. The profile process 250 accesses a profile data base have information associated..." This cookie must contain the ID for the user in order to cause promotional information e.g. profile data to be retrieved. Then, the applicant argues that there is a misuse of "CID [customer identification]" for "identification value." Looking at Figures 3 & 7-8, Gardenswartz utilizes the CID as an identification value along with the cookie number (see col.8, lines 45-55 & col.11, line 65 - col.12, line 17). Applicant's arguments, regarding claims 4, 7, and 8, have been addressed. Locations/disclosures of the limitations of claims 4, 7, and 8 have been included above.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fawaad Haider whose telephone number is 571-272-7178. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Fawaad Haider

Examiner

Art Unit 3627

FIH

 4/21/07
F. RYAN ZEENDER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER